

30/11/05 Yaron Mayer

20/21

Appl. No. 10/615,981

Amdt. dated Nov. 30, 2005

Reply to Office action of June 30, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Regarding clause 1 of your examination report, I respectfully submit that the independent generic claims are patentable for the reasons explained below. Therefore, the other set of claims should not be withdrawn from consideration. In addition, claim 6 was mistakenly included in the withdrawn group, since claim 6 deals with a laser printer, so anyway it should not be withdrawn.
2. Regarding clause 2 of your examination report, I have corrected the informalities. However, regarding the use of the words "at least one of" in claims 7, 18, 23, 24, 26, 28, 36, 39, 40 & 41, I respectfully submit that there is no contradiction between their clauses, and therefore the words "at least one of" are appropriate. Also, there is no problem of enablement because the clarification section in the specification states clearly that **"Throughout the patent whenever variations or various solutions are mentioned, it is also possible to use various combinations of these variations or of elements in them, and when combinations are used, it is also possible to use at least some elements in them separately or in other combinations. These variations are preferably in different embodiments. In other words: certain features of the invention, which are described in the context of separate embodiments, may also be provided in combination in a single embodiment. Conversely, various features of the invention, which are described in the context of a single embodiment, may also be provided separately or in any suitable sub-combination"**. In addition, it is repeated in multiple additional places in the specification that various combinations of these solutions or variations can also be used. Only in claim 17 the two clauses may seem contradictory, but even that combination is actually possible since for example in a color laser printer there can be multiple cartridges, so there can be for example a combination in which for one color there are two cartridges, one on each side of the paper, and for another color the paper goes between two drums of the same cartridge. In

30/11/05 Yaron Mayer

21/21

addition, I would like to point out that for example elements like "the paper" or "the toner" in a laser printer are clear to any person skilled in the art, the same as for example it is clear that a car has wheels, so for example an independent claims that says "a car wherein the wheels are..." would be clear to anyone skilled in the art even without claiming wheels explicitly. However, I have added the claiming of the explicit elements as requested.

3. Regarding clauses 3-4 of your examination report, I have corrected claims 1 & 12 accordingly to exclude the configuration described by Silverbrook et. al.
4. Regarding clause 5 of your examination report, I have corrected claim 41 accordingly by removing some of its clauses.
5. Regarding clauses 6-9 of your examination report, I respectfully submit that:
Regarding claims 7 & 18, they should be allowed because these claims talk about the toner powder having the same weaker charge on both sides and the paper having a stronger charge, whereas Umeda talks about the paper having no charge and the toner powders having charges opposite to each other. Regarding claims 23-24, I have temporarily deleted clause a. However, since the independent claims should be allowed, these claims should be allowed anyway even without deleting clause a, since they recite additional patentable matter over the independent claims. Regarding claims 17, 28, 36 & 37, I respectfully submit that the Ishikawa patent is not relevant because it does not talk about a single toner cartridge having a plurality of drums, but on multiple color printing in which each drum is within its own cartridge (using multiple colors in the same cartridge would not work). Also, it does not deal with double sided printing. In addition, since the independent claims should be allowed, the dependent claims should also be allowed, since they recite additional patentable matter over the independent claims.

Respectfully submitted,
Yaron Mayer

